

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, which place the application into condition for allowance.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-74 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 13, 16, 24, 35, 46 and 58 are amended, and new claim 79 has been added. No new subject matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the Application as originally filed, specifically in paragraphs 0063 and 0064 of the specification as originally filed. No estoppel as to equivalents is intended.

Claims 77-78 were objected to as being directed to non-elected claims. Accordingly, the status of these claims is hereby changed to "withdrawn."

### **II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 2, 3, 16, 46-57 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, these claims have been amended, without prejudice or any intention of creating estoppel as to equivalents. It is respectfully requested that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

### **III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 7, 12, 24, 26-27 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,081,402 to Koleda ("Koleda"). The Office Action states that Koleda was cited by the Examiner. To the contrary, Applicants would, however, like to submit that Koleda was filed in an IDS by the Applicants.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A radio-frequency (rf) control system ... wherein in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse.” (emphasis added)

As understood by the Applicants, Koleda relates to a wireless data transmission and control system containing a receiver/detector which is selectively activated for only certain intervals of time thereby allowing substantially all of the previously transmitted signals to be received.

In Koleda, a detector is activated through a duration substantially equal to a period of the signal (col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 7; Fig. 3). Moreover, in a preferred embodiment of Koleda, the duration is 10% longer than the period. On the contrary, according to the instant invention, the duration of detector activation is shorter when compared to a period of the signal. In the instant invention, activation duration is approximately 80  $\mu$ sec and a period of the signal is approximately 5000  $\mu$ sec. *Instant Application*, paragraphs 63 and 64; Fig. 6.

Applicants further submit that contrary to Koleda, the instant invention permits to limit the activation duration of the receiver and to save power. It is the time between two activation durations of the receiver that ascertain the detection of the preamble pulses in the instant invention. This time is chosen in order to ascertain that the receiver will be energized during an electromagnetic wave, if a preamble pulse is sent. Thus, in the instant invention the activation duration of the receiver should be as short as possible. Only an activation duration allowing checking if an electromagnetic wave is present or not is required.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Koleda does not teach or disclose the above identified feature of claim 1. Specifically, Koleda does not teach or suggest a radio-frequency (rf) control system wherein in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art. For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is submitted that independent claim 24 patentably distinguishes over Koleda and is therefore allowable.

Further in the Office Action, Claims 5-6, 13-16, 18, 23, 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Koleda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,454 to Yu (“Yu”).

Claims 9, 31, 35, 37-38, 42 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Koleda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,292 to Terreault (“Terreault”).

Claims 11, 33, 46-48, 52, 56-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Koleda in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,636,243 to Tanaka (“Tanaka”).

Claims 58, 60-61, 63, 68, 69 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Koleda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,470 to Naidu (“Naidu”).

As understood by the Applicants, Yu relates to a technique for activating an active-mode high frequency clock following a sleep period for use within a mobile station.

As understood by the Applicants, Terrault relates to a radio transceiver having a receive mode and transmit mode, wherein the transceiver makes use of an application controller to control the operation of the transmitter and receiver portions of the transceiver.

As understood by the Applicants, Tanaka relates to an Interterminal direct communication in digital mobile communication system between PHS terminals, each terminal detects an intermittent timing signal from a predetermined control channel of the base station.

As understood by the Applicants, Naidu relates to a system for reducing cumulative noise in a distributed antenna network including a plurality of remote antenna units with each remote antenna unit including a receiver for receiving input signals, a signal strength processor for

determining whether a valid signal is present at its respective remote antenna unit and an output controller for switching off the network connection when no valid signal is present.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references relate to a radio-frequency (rf) control system for controlling a component of a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like, as recited in the instant claims.

Additionally, Koleda does not teach or suggest an RF system as disclosed in the claims.

Therefore, Applicants submit that there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Koleda with the Yu, Terrault, Tanaka or Naidu.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 13, 24, 35, 46 and 58 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art, and are therefore allowable.

#### **IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

The Examiner has apparently made of record, but not applied, several documents. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and an early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Any fee occasioned by this paper may be charged, or overpayment credited to, Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald R. Santucci  
Reg. No. 28,988

Telephone: (212) 588-0800  
Facsimile: (212) 588-0500